Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

**Point 1:** The references are not updated with a total of 26 with only 1 reference from the last 7 years – 17 from 2000-2009 and 8 from 1999 or before. This shows how superficial the authors worked in this paper without providing a review of the latest work done in the study area – at least that should been done. For instance, with a short (1 min max) research, I found the following article:

**Response 1:** Thank you, we have quoted the latest articles in the relevant fields.

**Point 2:** The authors at some moments specify some pollutants and some techniques and at others provide different information.

**Response 2:** We removed pollutants that were not analyzed.

**Point 3:** A huge amount of results is based on no available experimental data and no references from other works to back up the statements.

**Response 3:** We have given the relevant data to the data source or documentation support.

**Point 4:** Last paragraph of the abstract should be before.

**Response 4:** Changed.

**Point 5:** There is no paragraph stating what are the goals of the study in the introduction, the experimental section is too weak without supling the minimum information to the reader understand how the experimental setup and monitoring was done (there should be sub-sections: study area, sampling campaign (when, where); type of equipments, statistical treatment,…); there is no conclusions.

**Response 5:** Thank you for your suggestions, we have made changes to the full text as you requested.

**Point 6:** Different units trough the paper

**Response 6:** We checked the full text of the unit and made a correction.

**Point 7:** Lack of references everyone

**Response 7:** We've added 7 new documents to support the content of the manuscript.


**Point 8:** In the “Material and Methods”, the authors state that evaluate water soluble ions… no results are presented.

**Response 8:** We deleted this part because it didn't have a specific application.

**Point 9:** The authors say at some point that the sampling was done at 7 different times in a 3 moment period. In the discussion, they say that the sampling was done in different sites within the city. It is impossible to evaluate a paper like this.

**Response 9:** We hope that sampling in different places will improve the universality of the data without being pseudo-representative of a point. We will update this section in the next study and thank you for your reminder.

**Point 10:** What is “percentage of total number of days (%)” on table 2?

**Response 10:** We've labeled it after the table. * Number of days of major air pollutant per year as a proportion of total days.

**Point 11:** Is not possible to compare maximum concentrations with average concentrations like the authors do (lines 134-138)

**Response 11:** It is possible that we have already made a note.

**Point 12:** Figures don’t have the years to which the sampling refers to.

**Response 12:** We have explained -- the average monthly level from 2004-2010.

**Point 13:** No information about how the data that is analysed was obtained.

**Response 13:** We've given a description in the material and methods sections.

**Point 14:** At some point, the authors provide analysis for other pollutants (SO2 and NO2) and parameters (wind and so on) – what data is that?

**Response 14:** We've removed pollutants that didn't analyzed.
**Point 15:** Figure 5 – ratios? How can the reader understand the PMx concentrations? What are the dots?

**Response 15:** Changed.